

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 10-20 remain in the application. Claims 10-20 are subject to examination. Claim 10 has been amended.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13-15 and 18 have been rejected as being obvious over EP 0825 506 A2 to Thibault et al. in view of the publication entitled, "Pattern Oriented Software Architecture: A System Of Patterns" authored by Buschman et al. (the Examiner has listed the author's first name and has referred to this publication as Frank et al.) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 10 has been amended to better define the invention. Support for the changes can be found by referring to the translated specification at page 4, lines 9-18 and at page 5, lines 17-18.

Claim 10 now defines:

- a) performing the step of calling the processing routines by managing, with the runtime system, a dynamic memory area of a random access memory of a computer, and
- b) stipulating an order in which the processing routines are called by having

the runtime system access a configuration file stored in the memory area and having the runtime system execute lines of the configuration file in succession such that the processing routines, which are listed in the lines of the configuration file, are called by addresses of the processing routines.

Limitations a) and b), which have been copied above, are not taught or suggested by Thibault et al. or Buschman et al.

Thibault et al. as a whole, and in particular, column 5, line 57- column 6, line 5, column 2, lines 18-33, Fig. 2: "omopenlist", "dpchange", "omupdate", and column 9, lines 43-46, which have been cited in the Office action, do not disclose limitations a) and b) that have been copied above.

Buschman et al. (Pattern-Oriented Software ...) do not teach or suggest the limitations a) and b) that have been copied above. Additionally, contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Buschman et al. do not teach or suggest the following claimed limitation:

- c) calling the processing routines in succession with the runtime system and supplying data in a called processing routine to the input interface of an immediately adjoining processing routine

Buschman et al. teach processing routines (software-modules "filter"), which enrich, refine or transform the data fed to them (page 55). A data stream flows successively through the filters, which are connected by pipes (page 55). In this way, the filters build a processing sequence. Each filter is fed data by the previous filter in the processing sequence (page 55, paragraph 2, and page 56 paragraph 1).

The filters are called by an adjacent filter in the sequence according to three different methods disclosed on page 55, paragraph 3. For example, as per the second method, a filter calls the next filter in the sequence by pushing new data to the filter (see page 55 paragraph 3). In this respect, the processing routines are not called with a runtime system as specified by features c) and b), which have been copied above. This is still true with respect to page 64, where a main program calls an active filter to start the processing sequence (see page 64, set up the processing pipeline).

Additionally, Buschman et al. do not teach a runtime system managing a dynamic memory area in the RAM of a computer (feature a). Buschman et al. also do not teach stipulating an order in which the processing routines are called by having the runtime system access a configuration file stored in the memory area and having the runtime system execute lines of the configuration file in succession such that the processing routines, which are listed in the lines of the configuration file, are called by addresses of the processing routines (feature b).

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teachings of Thibault et al. and Buschman et al., the claimed invention would not have been obtained for the reasons discussed above.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12, 16, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected as being obvious over EP 0825 506 A2 to Thibault et al. in view of in view of the publication entitled, "Pattern Oriented Software Architecture: A System Of Patterns" authored by Buschman et al. and further in view of in view of published U.S. Patent Application 2003/0014500 A1 to Schleiss et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if there were a suggestion to combine the teaching of Schleiss et al. with the teachings of Thibault et al. and Buschman et al., the invention as defined by claims 12, 16, 17, and 19-20 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to the invention as defined by claim 10.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 10. Claim 10 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-20 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101